

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful examination of this case. Reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested in view of the instant remarks.

In view of the objections raised in the Office Action, claims 1 – 10 are deleted and they are replaced by new claims 11 – 18. New claim 11 includes various features in combination, thereby meeting the objection on page 2 of the Office Action that original claim 1 was a single means claim.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected Claim 1 as being unpatentable over USA Patent No. 6,356,664 to Dunn et al.

The new claim 11 is believed to be patentable over Dunn et al.

As mentioned by the Examiner, Dunn et al discloses an apparatus comprising framestore demultiplexing means (column 6 lines 37 – 40 and lines 53 – 55) for creating a specific area of interest which has a higher frame rate than a surrounding area (column 6 lines 59 – 62 and column 7 lines 25 – 31). It is noted that Dunn actually discloses that:

a computer system 21 places the incoming information into a total picture buffer store 22 and also applies the incoming information synchronously to monitor 23 to display the corresponding video frame images.

It is noted that Dunn et al also discloses that:

information in buffers 22 and 26 is then sampled by computer system 21 at selected repetition rates proportioned to weights assigned to buffers 26.

Dunn et al goes on to say at column 6 line 40 that:

light pen 24 and keyboard 25 allow portions of displayed frame images to be marked off.

Dunn et al does not disclose carrying out any of the operations in real-time. Clearly marking off part of the image with a light pen cannot be carried out in real-time.

Furthermore, even although Dunn et al discloses sampling the image at different frame rates, Dunn et al also discloses at column 2 line 66 to column 3 line 1 that:

in this arrangement, portions of video (or motion picture) frames, taken from a common source such as a camera or a replayed video tape, are assigned a plurality of different importance ratings.

Therefore, in Dunn et al, the image source is a single image source in which different frame rates are assigned to different areas of that single source.

Dunn et al does not disclose the invention of the new claim 11 in which a complete image is formed from at least two low frame rate image sources and at least one high frame rate image source. Also, marking off the portions of the image with a light pen as in Dunn et al to identify areas with a differing frame rate, does not disclose the Applicant's insertion of the high frame rate image from a second source anywhere in the low resolution background in real-time.

The Applicants rely for patentability of new claims 12 – 18 on the fact that these claims include all of the features of claim 11, which claim 11 is believed to be allowable for the above reasons.

In accordance with the Applicant's duty to disclose all known prior art, it is mentioned that the Applicants have corresponding United Kingdom and European patent applications. The European patent application has not yet been searched. The United Kingdom patent application has been searched and the Examiner cited JP 10-257450 and GB 2356757. Both of these two citations were only cited as Category "A" citations to indicate technological background and/or state of the art. An appropriate Information Disclosure Statement is filed herewith.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this **RESPONSE** is found to be **INCOMPLETE**, or if at any time it appears that a **TELEPHONE CONFERENCE** with Counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or one of his associates, collect in Waltham, Massachusetts, at (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jason D. Shanske  
Reg. No. 43,915